

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 8, 2003. Claims 124-26 and 128-36 remain presented for examination. Claims 124 and 134-36, the independent claims, and Claim 129 have been amended to define more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 124-26 and 128-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 5,398,311 (Seto) in view of U.S. Patents 4,897,638 (Kokunishi et al.) and 5,562,350 (Sakurai).

The general nature of the invention, and the prior art, have been adequately discussed in Applicant's prior papers, and it is not deemed necessary to repeat that discussion in full.

Independent Claim 124 is directed to an outline forming apparatus that comprises a storage medium that stores information for a plurality of outline points of a pattern, where the information for each of the outline points includes: (I) a coordinate value and the vector data for indicating a movement track of the outline point according to a change of a weight value; and (ii) a weight value at which the movement track changes, wherein the coordinate value and the vector data exist for each movement tracks, and the weight value indicates the thickness of the pattern in the same font size. (An example is shown in Fig. 24, but it is to be understood that the claim scope is not limited by the details of this or any other embodiment.)

By virtue of the above feature, various outline point control can be achieved by a single outline point data set. For example, changes of a pattern design according to a weight value as shown in Figure 5 can be achieved by a single outline point data set. That

is, according to the claimed invention, it is not necessary to prepare plural outline data sets in order to change the pattern design according to weight value. Use of a single outline point data set reduces amount of data that has to be generated, stored and processed, as compared with using a plurality of outline point data sets.

Seto relates to a system in which the thickness of each stroke of a pattern is controlled in accordance with a change of character size, and *Sakurai*, to a system that changes a font data set in accordance with a font size.

Kokunishi relates to a system that changes stroke thickness in accordance with character pattern scaling factor (see Figs. 7A and 7B). Fig. 7B shows that each character size has a plurality of thickness classes, each of which has its own stroke thickness. However, the thickness class is assigned to each of the strokes constituting a character pattern. Applicant strongly asserts that nothing has been found, or pointed out, in *Kokunishi* that would teach or suggest changing weight in a single given character size.

Applicant submits that in fact, all three cited patents fail to teach or suggest changing stroke thickness in the same font size. Moreover, the *Seto* system moves a coordinates point in accordance with font size, but this is not believed to teach or suggest changing movement track (change of pattern design) of the coordinates point, while the *Kokunishi* system changes stroke shape in accordance with edge side shape class as shown in Figs. 4 and 11B, the stroke shape is assigned to each stroke and the stroke shape type does not change in accordance with weight value.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that even if combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action (and even assuming such combination would be proper) the result would still not meet the terms of Claim 124, nor would the result provide an

apparatus capable of providing the advantage of an apparatus constructed according to that claim. Accordingly, Claim 124 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The other independent claims each recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 124 and therefore are also believed to be patentable for the reasons discussed above.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Leonard P. Diana", written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant
Leonard P. Diana
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 368360 v1